The monthly meeting of the Town of Ulster Planning Board was held on Thursday September 25, 2008at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall Lake Katrine, New York., The following members were present:

Chairman Gerard Beichert

Larry Decker Frank Almquist Renno Budziak

Town Planner: Alan Sorensen

The Pledge to the flag was recited. The fire exits were designated

## **Ulster Manor**

Mr. Beichert states the Board will hold 2 separate meetings for the Ulster Manor project. On November 10<sup>th</sup> the consultants on the project will review the FEIS with the Board. There will be no public input at the November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. A vote on the FEIS will take place on December 15<sup>th</sup>.

## Fink/Crystal Ridge Subdivision

Chris DiChiaro appeared on behalf of the application for a 12 lot subdivision. Chris states the road plan has been changed the applicant has added a number of 15' x 40' areas which a vehicle could pull off the road in case of an emergency. The final stormwater plans along with the final approval from the UCHD have been submitted. The issue of the approval of the wavier for the 1,200 foot roadway needs to be resolved. Town code states the wavier must be granted by the Planning and Town Board as well as the Highway Superintendent. After a long discussion on how the process works a motion was made to approve the wavier as there is no other way to access the site, areas for emergency pull offs have been incorporated into the plan and the road is to be a private road. All were in favor of the wavier. Mr. Sorensen states the board will need to hold a Public Hearing and send a notice to the Town of Saugerties. The notice to Saugerties is needed as the property borders the Town of Saugerties. All other issues have been completed and all issues are compliant.

**Action:** A Public Hearing will be scheduled for October 23, 2008.

## **Bunocore Site Plan**

Joseph Pisani appeared on behalf of the application for a site plan. Mr. Pisani reviewed the issues that need to be resolved in Mr. Sorensen's memo.

- a. The storage materials stored behind the garage on the site have been removed.
- b. The applicants engineer Mr. Standford is working with the NYS DOT; the applicant will comply with the requirements of the DOT.

c. The applicant is reaching out to the Health Department; Mr. Pisani states the septic issue was resolved at the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Board accepted the septic system.

Mr. Zweben explains to the Board that the ZBA did not require Health Department approval when reviewing the use variance as the Board knew it would be an issue when the applicant submitted a site plan. Mr. Pisani goes on to state he was in possession of a letter from Mr. Lou Perry stating a dye test was completed and the system passed. (Letter was not submitted to the file) Mr. Zweben states the building code violations on this site have been satisfied by the court. This does not mean that there are no building code violations on the site just that there are no outstanding charges. The Building Department has not inspected the building; there may be code violations when the building is inspected. The violations have been solved by pleas. Mr. Beichert states the Board conducted a site visit and is concerned about 2 structures on the site. The mobile home and what is being called the office are in disrepair. There are letters in the Building Department file from 2 Building Inspectors stating the structures I questions should be removed from the site. The Board would like the applicant to supply an inspection from a structural engineer. The office building is a third use on the site and if it is to remain the site plan will need to be revised to show adequate parking. A picture was submitted to the file showing the storage material has been removed. No action was taken by the Board.

# **Davenport Site Plan**

Allen Dumas appeared on behalf of the application for a site plan; the addition of a greenhouse structure on an existing site. Mr. Dumas states the applicant has added a greenhouse structure to the site. The structure is approximately 1,440 sq ft with an arched roof. There are no walls to the structure. A discussion followed on the need for an area variance. The structure is 3 feet from the property line but approximately 64 feet from Washington Avenue. Mr. Davenport states the structure would be removed from the site if the business left the site. Mr. Sorensen states the plan will need to be referred to NYS DOT and the County Planning Board.

**Action:** A motion to refer the plan to the Zoning Board of Appeals with the recommendation to approve was made by Mr. Decker with a second from Mr. Almquist with all in favor.

#### **Felton Lot Line Revision**

Dan McCarthy appeared on behalf of the application for a lot line revision. Mr. McCarthy states the applicant was recently granted approval on a 2 lot subdivision; the applicant would is now proposing a lot line revision of 50 feet. The applicant would like to own a pond that is borders his property. Mr. Sorensen states a pond is split between the two properties at this time and the revision will place the pond on the applicants property only; the maps have been revised the Board could render a Negative Declaration and grant approval of the lot line revision.

**Action:** A motion was made by Mr. Almquist to issue a negative declaration as per SEQRA with a second by Mr. Beichert. All were in favor. A motion to grant the lot line revision was made by Mr. Decker with a second by Mr. Almquist; all were in favor

# RESOLUTION TOWN OF ULSTER TOWN BOARD

Request for Lot Line Adjustment Kirk & Audrey Felton and Fiore Section 39.001, Block 2, Lots 18 & 19

WHEREAS, the Planning Board and its consultant planner have reviewed an application by Kirk & Audrey Felton for a Lot Line Adjustment within the R-60-Residential Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, materials submitted in support of the proposed action include:

- Application for Lot Line Adjustment prepared by Daniel McCarthy dated September 10, 2008;
- Short EAF prepared by Daniel McCarthy dated September 10, 2008; and
- *Sketch Plan Lot Line Change Map* prepared by Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. dated 9/10/08.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board considered of the application materials submitted by the applicant in support of the proposed action, along with the comments of its consultants made via memoranda (which memoranda are incorporated herein by reference); and

WHEREAS, the affected lots that are the subject of this Lot Line Adjustment will continue to comply with the bulk requirements of the R 60-Residential Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 161-11.1 (B) of the Town Code, the proposed action does not require a public hearing, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board upon review of the entire record (including SEQRA Short EAF) found the Lot Line Adjustment will not have an adverse impact on the environment; as Lead Agency made a determination of non-significance and issued a Negative Declaration pursuant to Part 617 of SEQRA.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board has determined that they have complied fully with the procedural requirements of Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA); and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that upon full consideration of the above, the Planning Board hereby grants approval of Lot Line Adjustment application by Kirk & Audrey Felton and Fiore.

Motioned by: Seconded by:

All in Favor: Ozzie Beichert, Chairman Frank Almquist, Vice Chairman

Larry Decker

Renno Budzia

George Lucente

## **Boice Request for Extension**

Mr. Beichert states that he has contacted the Building Inspector on the matter of Mr. Boice's request. Mr. Boice submitted an application to the building department following his site plan approval last year. The architect was asked to revise the plans to the building and has yet to do so. Mr. Boice was unaware that the plans were not submitted to the building department. After a long discussion on the site it was decided to extend the site plan 90 days with the condition that an as built plan of the garage be submitted for approval to the building department, and some site improvements need to be addressed. Specifically the screening on the side of the building needs to be completed. These items need to be addressed within 90 days after the 90 days the board will review the site fro another extension.

**Action:** A motion to extend the site plan with the condition of a building plan be submitted to the building department and the screening on the site be installed within 90 days was made by Mr. Budziak and seconded by Mr. Beichert. All were in favor.

A motion to adjourn Mr. Almquist was made by and seconded by Mr. Decker all were in favor

Respectfully Submitted

Mary Secreto Planning Secretary